



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,985	01/05/2007	Joachim Beine	1131-18-PCT-PA-TD	5542
22145	7590	08/30/2010	EXAMINER	
KLEIN, O'NEILL & SINGH, LLP 18200 VON KARMAN AVENUE SUITE 725 IRVINE, CA 92612			WILLIAMS, STEPHANIE ELAINE	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		3754
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		08/30/2010 PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/571,985	BEINE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	STEPHANIE E. WILLIAMS	3754	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2010.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 19-42 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 19-41 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 42 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Specification***

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "comprises" and "said" should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 19-26,29-31,37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cobb (3,727,803).
4. The Cobb reference discloses apparatus and method of a molded container (see fig.1) capable of holding liquid infusion, said container including a plurality of walls including a first side wall (11) and a second side wall (11), two collapsible walls (near 13; see figs. 1&2) each being disposed in between the first side wall (11) and the

second side wall (11), a bottom wall (10) configured for standing upright (see fig.1), and a shoulder portion (sloped portion above 11; see fig.1) having a port (at 12) for filling fluid into or discharging fluid out of an interior cavity (inside of container) defined by the plurality of walls, wherein the bottom wall (10) includes an interior wall surface (inside surface of bottom wall) and an exterior wall surface (outside surface of bottom wall) and a fold line (col.2, lines 17-20) separating the interior wall surface into a first interior section and a second interior section; and wherein portions of the first interior section and the second interior section of the bottom wall (10) move closer to one another and wherein portions of the exterior wall surface (outside surface of bottom wall) of the bottom wall (10) move outwardly away from the interior cavity (inside of container) from a first position relative to the interior cavity to a second further outward position relative to the interior cavity when the container collapses (see fig.4).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 32-36,40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cobb in view of Schaefer (4,986,053).

The Cobb reference discloses substantially all the structure and functionality of the invention; however the Cobb reference lacks the preform of the container being a multi-layer preform consisting of an overall wall thickness.

The Schaefer teaches a the method of manufacturing the perform of the container having a multi-layer perform consisting of an overall wall thickness (see fig.1); and wherein at least one of the layers is a layer of adhesive agent (18); and wherein at least one of the layers is a layers is made from an ethylene/vinyl alcohol material (14); and wherein an outer layer is made of a polyamide or a polyester material (16) for the purpose of holding/packaging a various of products.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have reasonably modified the container of the Cobb device to have a perform container with multi-layers as taught by Schaefer in order to provide a holding for certain volatile materials without shorting the life use of the container itself.

7. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cobb in view of Schaefer (4,986,053) as applied to claim 38 above, and further in view of Larkin et al. (4,547,900).

The Cobb and Schaefer references disclose substantially all the structure and functionality of the invention; however the both references lack two ports at the discharge end of the container.

The Larkin et al. reference teaches a container for liquids having a discharge end consisting of two ports (13,14) for the purpose of being sealed until dispensing of contents takes place. Larkin further discloses a of

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have reasonably modified the Cobb device to provide the method of having two ports at the discharge end as taught by Larkin et al. in order to provide orifices to dispense liquid from the container therethrough.

8. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cobb in view of Larkin et al. (4,547,900).

The Cobb reference discloses substantially all the structure and functionality of the invention; however the Cobb reference lacks a container with a port having a pierceable membrane.

The Larkin et al. reference teaches a container for liquids having a discharge end having at least one port (13) with a pierceable membrane (15,17) for the purpose of withdrawing liquid from the container.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have reasonably modified the Cobb device to have a port with a pierceable member as taught by Larkin et al. in order to provide the user with a sanitary and safe way of drawing fluid from the container.

9. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cobb in view of Braun (3,171,412).

The Cobb reference discloses substantially all the structure and functionality of the invention; however the Cobb reference lacks the bottom wall of the container having a projecting suspension plug.

The Braun reference teaches a container (11) for biological liquids having a bottom wall with a projecting suspension lug (12) for the purpose of suspending the container to expel the liquids efficiently from the container.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have reasonably modified the bottom wall of Cobb device to have a projecting suspension plug as taught by Braun in order to provide the user with hand off way of dispensing fluids from the container as desired.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

10. Claim 42 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would appear to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 19-42 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to STEPHANIE E. WILLIAMS whose telephone number is (571)272-8059. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. E. W./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3754

/Kevin P. Shaver/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3754